The Honourable Lincoln Goldie,

Provincial Secretary.

Re Industrial Farm at Langstaff and the Women's Farm at Concord.

We beg to make the following report as a result of our inquiry into the above Institutions.

We were instructed by letter dated January 22, 1926 to make this investigation.

It was the wish and intention of the late Honourable W.J.Hanna in the establishment of Industrial Farms that the Province at all times should bend its energies toward the reclamation and restoration of these unfortunate prisoners by giving them every reasonable opportunity for the building up of the moral,physical and mental well being of the man so that if possible he may assume his place in free life as a useful member of society.

There is no factor more important in accomplishing this ideal than the atmosphere of fair dealing to one and all prisoners alike. No prisoner because of his public prominence, financial standing or influential friends should have an opportunity for better things than the humblest and pporest unfortunate inmate in residence. To secure this ideal one rule for all is the only safe and just basis that will stand the test. Any variation of this rule is subversive to justice and bound to work disaster. Therefore it is very important that we establish the entire field of penal administration on solid foundation and entrust to highly qualified superintendents especially fitted by training and temperament to this exacting field.

We find that the farms at Langstaff and Concord comprise 940 acres. The farm at Langstaff is for men only

while the one at Concord is for women although a party of men is sent over each day to work on the women's farm under a guard while the farm guard lives at the women's farm. The buildings are in excellent condition with the possible exception of one or two of the out-buildings such as the piggery.

We found sleeping in the administration building about sixty to seventy old men over sixty years of age. These men are not really prisoners but have been sent to the gaol farm to give them refuge. It is true they have been committed for vagrancy but in many instances this committal is only a matter of form to get them to the farm. The great proportion of these men are quite unfit to do any work on the farm.

The buildings on the farm are all the property of the City of Toronto. No monies of any description have been expended by the Province.

The farm can accommodate 300 comfortably. The industries at the farm are strictly limited to farming in all its branches,--dairying, piggery and a poultry farm are maintained and both grain and hoe crops are raised.

There seems to be a distinct difference of opinion between the property commissioner of the City of Toronto and the superintendent regarding the object of the farm itself. Mr.Chisholm states in his evidence that he is trying to run the place as a modern up to date gaol farm and he has no idea of making it a model farm. He adds that the short term inmates that are up at Langstaff are not capable of doing the work necessary to make the place a model farm (see page 332 line 30). On the other hand Major Morrison has the idea that the farm should be a model one, and accordingly friction arises over the type of cattle, horses and other farm stock purchased for the

farm. It should be noted that the whole farm is the property of the City of Toronto and that all the salaries are paid by the City. All of the staff, with two exceptions are appointed with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, the two exceptions being the steward and the engineer who are appointed by the Board of Control. They have certain duties which are set out in minutes of a Board of Control meeting and are as follows;-

> "Ordered that the property commissioner is hereby designated as the City's head of the municipal farms and to have complete control and administration of all matters in which his jurisdiction of the City is exercised, such as erection of buildings, equipment, purchasing and care of stock, purchasing of supplies,equipment and general working of the farms; the steward also to be under the property commissioner and carry out his instructions so far as general work is concerned and to be subject to the ordinary discipline required of all employees at the farms."

During our survey of this farm we found that the question of dual control was raised at every point by the superintendent. He seems to blame all the trouble and friction that now exists at the farm to the property commissioner. From our investigation we have come to the conclusion that this has become an obsession with the superintendent and there is no reason why any trouble should arise if the superintendent at the farm worked in harmony with the property commissioner. We are backed in this opinion by the evidence of Major Basher (page 5) where he states that his steward is under the property commissioner and he says further that this does not work any hardship and that if he wants anything at any moment he goes direct to Mr.Chisholm. He added that he has been Governor of the Toronto gaol for six years and has never had any trouble with Mr.Chisholm and has found him very reasonable to get on with.

Major Morrison was appointed superintendent of the gaol farm on the 22nd of June,1917 at a salary of $2000.00 per annum, and a free house. The salary was subsequently raised to $2500.00 per annum. At the time of his appointment Property Commissioner Chisholm was overseeing the farm with Deputy Superintendent S.B. Weir actually in charge. We have ascertained that Major Morrison has practically no friends at the Institution with the exception of two or three, and of these, Cooper, the clerk in charge of records is the only one who impressed us favourably. There is at present very poor discipline at the farm (page 28 evidence S.B.Weir; Quantz the farmer, page 57; Mylks the chef and guard, page 75; Mr.Rollett the steward page 86; Guard J.Armstrong,page 136; and Hagen the engineer, page 114). The superintendent makes a practise of talking to prisoners, listens to their complaints and in fact reviews their sentences. In regard to this see evidence of Guard J.Armstrong, page 138.

Major Morrison in his own evidence on page 287, admitted having gone over the judgment in the case of Prisoner Katz and Prisoner Gillan (pages 288 and 289). In the case of Adams Major Morrison stated that he knew Adams was in for a breach of the Drug Act but he also stated that he knew Adams had never used drugs. He also stated that he knew Katz was not guilty and that Judge Coatsworth and Crown Attorney Murphy had both stated that a mistake had been made. In regard to Gillan, he stated that he was in prison as a result of a mistake of law. When Major Morrison was asked if it was not fatal for him to attempt to review cases he stated that perhaps he had made mistakes regarding this. His curiosity regarding the cases of prisoners seems to be very great. He is always going over their cases with them. These questions or reviews always

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Ontario Council of University Libraries

http://www.archive.org/details/b249455

take place in the office where there are prisoners around. His language regarding officials at the City Hall has been such as would tend to cause these officials to be held in disrespect at the gaol farm. Mr.Hagen swears on page 117 that Major Morrison used obscene language regarding several of the officials. We find that he has lost the support entirely of all the women staff at Concord by reason of his domineering and interfering manner, and also by reason of his conduct there (see evidence of Dr.Langstaff on pages 214 - 217 and 220) also evidence of Guard Leece on page 224; Miss Carson, pages 228-229 - 232 and 233; Mrs. Wallace 238 and 239; and Miss Thierry, page 241). We also find that he has shown lack of judgment and actual favoritism in his treatment of prisoners. Prisoner Katz was allowed to live in Morrison's house. He was permitted to use the telephone and also to see his family at any time he so desired. He did not have to dress in gaol clothes and he had his meals at Morrison's house (see Morrison's evidence on page 288; Hagen's evidence, page 118; and A. Armstrong's evidence on page 98). Although Major Morrison knew that Dr.Adams was sent to Langstaff for a breach of the Drug Act he chose him to go to Yonge Street for papers, unattended. He also showed marked favoritsm to Prisoner Gillam. Major Morrison has been most unfair to his Deputy. He does not notify him when he is leaving the Institution and has reprimanded him in front of prisoners (see evidence of Mr.Weir on pages 19-22 and 23). In fact Mr.Weir is at present ignored by the Superintendent at the farm, although he has the respect of a great majority of the guards.

Major Morrison has shown favoritsm to several of his guards. He has shown partiality to Guards Maguire and Reid. His treatment of Guard Mylks has been very unfair. This man although engaged as a chef has been made to alternate one week as chef and one week as guard. Mylks swears that

the reason for this treatment was spite by the Major (see pages 76 - 79 and 80). Guard Frisby swears (page 154) that Major Morrison threatened to send him to Burwash. This Major Morrison denies, but we believe Frisby is speaking the truth.

The Property Commissioner has sworn (page 339) that Major Morrison has caused him continual worry ever since he has been superintendent at the farm and Mr. Chisholm also states that he has never had any trouble at Concord or at Toronto gaol (page 339).

In conclusion we find a general spirit of unrest at the Institution. We find the guards quarreling amongst themselves. With the exception of Guard A. Ammstrong, not a single guard has any liking or respect for Major Morrison. We find Major Morrison to be untruthful, domineering, incompetent and totally unworthy of his position. We are firmly convinced that unless some steps are taken very soon, serious trouble will develop. After most serious consideration we believe that the only remedy would be to dispense with his services as superintendent.

We also believe that the Institution would be better off if Guards Reid and Maguire were both dismissed. There is plenty of evidence to show that these men are not the type to hold their present positions.

We would further recommend that the present practice of sending ten-day men from the Toronto gaol to the prison farm cease. (See Major Morrison's evidence, page 258, which will show what an absurdity this works out to be in some cases).

We would also strongly recommend that some very stringent form of punishment be devised and given to a certain type of repeater who is an absolute nuisance to

the farm. Some of these men get into trouble practically on the day they are released, and are back again at the farm. We believe that if more severe punishment were handed out in such cases it would prove a deterrent.

W. W. Dennison
A. Lee Pressey

Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, April 22, 1926.